



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BC8

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/185,212 11/03/98 MAEDA

H 48742

DAVID G CONLIN
DIKE BRONSTEIN ROBERTS & CUSHMAN
130 WATER STREET
BOSTON MA 02109

WM31/0309

EXAMINER

WALLERSON, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

6

DATE MAILED:

03/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/185,212

Applicant(s)
Maeda et al

Examiner
Mark Wallerson

Group Art Unit
2622



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 22, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2622

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on **12/22/2000**.
2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Allowable Subject Matter

3. The indicated allowability of claims 5-10 is withdrawn in view of the new rejection based on the reference(s) to Suzuki et. al. (U. S. 5,923,013). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2622

5. Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Suzuki) (U. S. 5,923,013).

With respect to claim 1, Suzuki discloses an image processing device (72) comprising image data input means (76 or 110, figure 12) for inputting image data; image data storage means (80) for storing the image data (column 8, lines 29-34); image data confirmation (identifying) means (78) for confirming (identifying) the characteristics (content) of the image data (column 5, lines 14-19; column 6, lines 56-64, and column 8, lines 11-28); management table means (92, figure 13) for managing the characteristics of each image data as management information of image data (column 8, lines 42-49 and column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9) with reference to the corresponding data stored in the image data storage means (80) (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9); image processing means (72) for performing image processing with respect to the image data (column 8, lines 11-49); second data storage means (90) for storing an image data which is subjected to image processing (column 8, lines 36-41 and column 9, lines 33-39), the management table having means for managing the image data stored in the second image data storage means in connection with the corresponding management information (column 8, line 36 to column 9, line 16).

With regard to claim 2, Suzuki discloses means for setting a processing mode of the image processing means (column 12, lines 29-44).

With respect to claim 3, Suzuki discloses that the management table (92) further includes a mode management section (which reads on the job description file) (column 8, lines 58-61) for

Art Unit: 2622

managing a processing mode (which reads on the number of print copies) as management information of the image data (column 16, lines 18-34), with reference to the image data stored in the storage means (which reads on saved job description files) (column 16, lines 13-17).

With regard to claim 4, Suzuki discloses an image processing management section (92) for performing image processing with respect to the image data based on the management information of the management table means (92) (column 11, lines 19-42).

With regard to claim 6, Suzuki discloses image output means (72) outputting the processed image data (column 9, lines 33-45), wherein the management table (92) further includes a management output section (94) for outputting the image data from the output means according to the management information (column 8, lines 46-57 and column 9, lines 33-45).

With respect to claims 7-10, Suzuki discloses that the management table produces a table consisting of a table for managing information relating to the image data and processing conditions for the image data (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 8) and document ID information (column 8, lines 42-45).

With respect to claim 12, Suzuki discloses that the image data is for use in a computer (host system) (column 4, lines 51-54), and that the image data input means (76) is interface means for receiving data from the computer (figure 12).

Art Unit: 2622

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Morikawa (U. S. 5,960,247).

Suzuki differs from claim 11 in that he does not clearly disclose that the image input means is a document image reading means for reading the image data of a document image.

Morikawa discloses a method of processing image data using a management table (figure 6) where a scan system (10) is used for reading the image data of an original (document) (column 3, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein the image input means is a document image reading means for reading the image data of a document image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Morikawa in order to allow the processing of print jobs on paper sheets.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2622

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Kusumoto (U. S. 6,088,135).

Suzuki differs from claim 13 in that he does not clearly disclose that the image data is image data for use in a facsimile machine, and that the input means is a facsimile interface means for receiving data from the facsimile machine.

Kusumoto discloses means for processing image data using a management table (figure 11), wherein the image data may be image data for use in a facsimile machine (column 1, lines 5-10 and lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein the image data is image data for use in a facsimile machine, and the input means is a facsimile interface means for receiving data from the facsimile machine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Kusumoto in order to be able to control the image processing in a facsimile by utilizing a management table.

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2622

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hamanaka et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Hamanaka) (U. S. 5,801,837).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, Suzuki discloses an image processing device (72) comprising first data storage means (80) for storing the image data (column 8, lines 29-34); second data storage means (90) for storing an image data which is subjected to image processing (column 8, lines 36-41 and column 9, lines 33-39); management table means (92, figure 13) for managing the characteristics of each image data as management information of image data (column 8, lines 42-49 and column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9) with reference to the corresponding data stored in the image data storage means (80) (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9). Suzuki differs from claims 14 and 15 in that he does not clearly disclose that the management table shows completion of the input of the first data and processing completion data.

Hamanaka discloses an image forming apparatus comprising a table that depicts image input completion and output completion of image data (figure 13 and column 9, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein the management table shows completion of the input of the first data and processing completion data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Hamanaka in order to improve processing in the device.

Art Unit: 2622

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA.

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Application/Control Number: 09/185,212

Page 9

Art Unit: 2622


MARK WALLERSON
PATENT EXAMINER

MARK WALLERSON